

<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
10/684,324	STUCHLIK ET AL.	
<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
Terrence R. Till	1744	

**Status of Application:** allowed

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Time:

☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No  
If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Rejection(s) discussed:

**Claims discussed:**

Prior art documents discussed:

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

James W. Hall

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: On 10/16/2006, the examiner called Applicant's representative to request that figures 1,3, 4, 6 and 8 be labeled "Amended" as they have been modified from the patented drawings. Additionally, the examiner and the applicant discussed the papers submitted 10/10/03. Applicant's representative had stated in his remarks that he had provided a substitute specification. The examiner called to see if applicant's representative truly meant to submit a substitute specification. Applicant's representative stated that the substitute specification was for the examiner's benefit; not meant as an official substitute specification amendment. On 10/18/06, applicant's representative faxed new drawings in response to the above requirement. On 11/1/06, the examiner told applicant's representative that the substitute specification had been categorized as for the examiner's benefit and not entered. .